

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-13 and 15-23 were pending. Claim 22 was canceled and claims 2, 6, 8, 21, and 23 were amended herein, all without prejudice and without acquiescence. Support for amendment to claim 21 is at least on page 22, line 20 through page 27, line 7 of the specification. No new matter is entered herein.

**I. Issues Under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph**

**A. Claim 8**

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

In particular, claim 8 was rejected for the term “represented by.” Claim 8 is amended herein accordingly, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

**B. Claims 2-13 and 15-20**

Claims 2-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 2 (i)(a) and claim 6 refer to peptides “having” certain sequence, and these claims are amended herein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

**C. Claim 22**

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

In particular, claim 22 was rejected because it was unclear due to reciting :one or more” of the listed antigens, whereas claim 21 required a differential T cell response to different antigens. Claim 22 is now canceled, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

## **II. Issue under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph**

Claims 21 and 23 were still rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the claims were rejected because the specification allegedly does not show any/all antigens from any/all other sources for determination whether there is a differential T cell response to different antigens in a human. The Examiner states that the specification only utilizes antigens from *M. tuberculosis* and only refers to particular antigens.

Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner. The skilled artisan would appreciate that describing multiple examples of antigens in the specification shows that the Applicants had possession of the invention at the time of filing. Nevertheless, to further the prosecution of this case, claim 21 is amended herein to reflect certain antigens, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

## **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-2375, under Order No. HO-P03388US0 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 12, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By\_\_\_\_/Melissa L. Sistrunk/\_\_\_\_  
Melissa L. Sistrunk  
Registration No.: 45,579  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
Fulbright Tower  
1301 McKinney, Suite 5100  
Houston, Texas 77010-3095  
(713) 651-5151  
(713) 651-5246 (Fax)  
Agent for Applicant